

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 7, 14, 15 and 20 have been amended.

Claim Objections

The Patent Office objected to claim 2 for a missing period.

Claim 2 has been amended.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Patent Office stated that claims 7, 14 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if added to the rejected claim independent claim.

Thank you.

Claim Rejections- 35 USC § 103

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-19 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuchs et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,141,770 (Fuchs).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Ryoka*, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). See also *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494 (C.C.P.A. 1970). Applicant respectfully submits that elements of claims 1, 8 and 15 have not been taught, disclosed or suggested by Fuchs. For example, claims 1, 8 and 15 recite multiple storage devices, including a first storage device and a second storage device. This is taught in the specification and drawings of the instant application, including FIG. 1 which shows a first storage device and a second storage device as separate and distinct entities.

Fuchs does not disclose, teach, or suggest multiple storage devices, rather, Fuchs teaches multiple CPUs with a single storage device. FIG. 3 of Fuchs displays a system

with 4 CPU units and a single system memory 46. Fuchs does not disclose, in any section of the specification or in any figure, multiple storage devices. The Patent Office, in its assertion that claims 1, 8 and 15 have been taught by Fuchs, referred to only a storage device, not multiple storage devices.

As a result, Fuchs fails to teach, disclose or suggest every element of claims 1, 8 and 15. Under *In re Ryoka*, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for claims 1, 8 and 15. Consequently, claims 1, 8 and 15 should be allowed, claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-20 should be allowed due to their dependence upon an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the forgoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
LSI Logic, Inc.

Dated: April 7, 2004

By: 

Chad W. Swartz
Reg. No. 46,329

SUITER · WEST PC LLO
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220
Omaha, NE 68154
(402) 496-0300 telephone
(402) 496-0333 facsimile